



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/995,159      | 11/27/2001  | James R. McCarthy    | PH-7345-A           | 1709             |

24348 7590 07/15/2002

BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB PHARMA COMPANY  
PATENT DEPARTMENT  
P.O. BOX 4000  
PRINCETON, NJ 08543-4000

|                               |              |
|-------------------------------|--------------|
| EXAMINER                      |              |
| BALASUBRAMANIAN, VENKATARAMAN |              |
| ART UNIT                      | PAPER NUMBER |

1624

DATE MAILED: 07/15/2002

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/995,159

Applicant(s)

MCCARTHY, JAMES R.

Examiner

Venkataraman Balasubramanian

Art Unit

1624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 June 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 4-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 4-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Applicant's election with traverse of Group V, claims 4-6, in Paper No. 5 is acknowledged. Applicants' cancellation of claims 1-3 and 7-18 in Paper No. 5 is also acknowledged.

The traversal is on the ground(s) that the searching the entire groups will not be serious burden and that the examiner has not shown that each of the groups is distinct and independent. This is not found persuasive because as noted in the previous office action, examiner had clearly delineated the reasons why the 25 groups are distinct and independent. Furthermore, examiner has shown that separate searches are required for these groups as they are classified differently.

In addition, the group VI wherein A and C are nitrogens with B as a CR group has been patented. Applicants have not shown or asserted in the traversal that all core groups embraced in the instant inventions are equivalent. In which case examiner needed not search all cores. A prior art which anticipates any one of the groups embraced by a specific core( i.e. choices of A, B,C) may then render rest of the core groups as obvious variant.

Examiner had applied several prior art in the parent application wherein A and C are nitrogens with B as a CR group. Were these groups are not independent and distinct, and then said prior art could be applied to the entire core of ring systems. Searching the entire core including the case where A, B and C are CR would be serious search burden given the limited time available for examining each case.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claims 4-6 are now pending.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Following reasons apply. Any claim not specifically rejected is rejected as being dependent on a rejected claim.

1. Recitation of the term "including" in the last line of claim 4, 20 renders the claim indefinite as the term is open-ended and can include more than what is being positively recited therein. See MPEP 2111.03 which states: The transitional term "comprising", which is synonymous with "including," "containing," or "characterized by," is inclusive or open-ended and does not exclude additional, unrecited elements or method steps. See, e.g., *Genentech, Inc. v. Chiron Corp.*, 112 F.3d 495, 501, 42 USPQ2d 1608, 1613 (Fed. Cir. 1997) ("Comprising" is a term of art used in claim language which means that the named elements are essential, but other elements may be added and still form a construct within the scope of the claim.); *Moleculon Research Corp. v. CBS, Inc.*, 793 F.2d 1261, 229 USPQ 805 (Fed. Cir. 1986); *In re Baxter*, 656 F.2d 679, 686, 210 USPQ 795, 803 (CCPA 1981); *Ex parte Davis*, 80 USPQ 448, 450 (Bd. App. 1948) ("comprising" leaves "the claim open for the inclusion of unspecified ingredients even in major amounts").

2. Note also that recitation of "stereoisomers and pharmaceutically acceptable salts thereof" is an improper Markush recitation. Markush recitation should be in alternate. As recited the claim is indefinite as it is not clear whether the claim is a compound claim or composition claim. Also note the singular compound and plural isomers and salts mix-up.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for stroke, anxiety and depression, does not reasonably provide enablement for all disorders due to hypersecretion of CRF generically embraced in the instant claim. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. Following reasons apply.

The instant claim 5 is drawn to "treating a disorder manifesting hypersecretion of CRF" The scope of the claims includes not only any or all disorders but also those disorder yet to be discovered for which there is no enabling disclosure. In addition, the scope of these claims includes treatment of various diseases, which is not adequately enabled solely based on the inhibiting CRF activity of the compounds provided in the specification at page16 and 51-53. From the reading of specification, it appears that the applicants are asserting that the embraced compounds because of their mode action which involves inhibition of effect of hypersecretion of CRF would be useful for all sorts

Art Unit: 1624

of disorders including endocrine, psychiatric, neurological disorders, epilepsy, etc. for which applicants provide no competent evidence. Furthermore, the applicants have not provided any competent evidence that the instantly disclosed tests are highly predictive for all the uses disclosed and embraced by the claim language for the intended host. That a single class of compounds can be used to treat all diseases embraced in the claims is an incredible finding for which applicants have not provided supporting evidence. Prior art search in the related area at the time of the invention was made do not lend support for treating all or any disorder based on the mode of action embraced. For example, the review of CRF suggests that the CRF of antagonists may be useful for treating depression and anxiety and suggests that the true cause of these disorders are yet unknown. See Mitchell, Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev. 22(5); 635-651, 1998 (PubMed Abstract provided). Note substantiation of utility and its scope is required when utility is "speculative", "sufficiently unusual" or not provided. See Ex parte Jovanovics, 211 USPQ 907, 909; In re Langer 183 USPQ 288 . Also note Hoffman v. Klaus 9 USPQ 2d 1657 and Ex parte Powers 220 USPQ 925 regarding type of testing needed to support in vivo uses.

Next, applicant's attention is drawn to the Revised Interim Utility and Written Description Guidelines, at 64 FR 71427 and 71440 (December 21, 1999) wherein it is emphasized that 'a claimed invention must have a specific and substantial utility'. The disclosure in the instant case is not sufficient to enable the instantly claimed method treating solely based on the inhibitory activity disclosed for the compounds. The state of the art is indicative of the requirement for undue experimentation.

In evaluating the enablement question, several factors are to be considered. Note *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 and *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546. The factors include: 1) The nature of the invention, 2) the state of the prior art, 3) the predictability or lack thereof in the art, 4) the amount of direction or guidance present, 5) the presence or absence of working examples, 6) the breadth of the claims, and 7) the quantity of experimentation needed.

1) The nature of the invention: Therapeutic use of the compounds in treating disorders that are manifesting hypersecretion of CRF.

2) The state of the prior art: A recent publication expressed that treating disorder by the inhibition of the effect of hypersecretion of CRF is still exploratory. See reference cited above.

3) The predictability or lack thereof in the art: Applicants have not provided any competent evidence or disclosed tests that are highly predictive for the pharmaceutical use for treating any or all condition of the instant compounds. Pharmacological activity in general is a very unpredictable area. Note that in cases involving physiological activity such as the instant case, "the scope of enablement obviously varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved". See *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970).

4) The amount of direction or guidance present and 5) the presence or absence of working examples: Specification has no working examples to show treating any or all condition and the state of the art is that the effects of inhibiting the effects of

Art Unit: 1624

hypersecretion of CRF are unpredictable and at best limited to modulation of anxiety and depression.

6) The breadth of the claims: The instant claims embrace any or all condition including those yet to be related to manifesting hypersecretion of CRF. 7) The quantity of experimentation needed would be an undue burden to one skilled in the pharmaceutical arts since there is inadequate guidance given to the skilled artisan, regarding the pharmaceutical use, for the reasons stated above.

Thus, factors such as "sufficient working examples", "the level of skill in the art" and "predictability", etc. have been demonstrated to be sufficiently lacking in the instant case for the instant method claims. In view of the breadth of the claims, the chemical nature of the invention, the unpredictability of receptor-ligand interactions in general, and the lack of working examples regarding the activity of the claimed compounds towards treating the variety of diseases of the instant claims, one having ordinary skill in the art would have to undergo an undue amount of experimentation to use the instantly claimed invention commensurate in scope with the claim.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 4 and 6 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action. Said claims would be allowed since specific species embraced in these claims are not taught or suggested by the art of record or from a search in the relevant art area. The closest prior art, Kiyama et al. Chem. Pharm. Bull., 43(3) 450-460, 1995., teaches structurally



Art Unit: 1624

related imidazo[4,5-c]pyridines which differ from instant compounds in not having the instant R<sub>1</sub> group.

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be addressed to Venkataraman Balasubramanian (Bala) whose telephone number is (703) 305-1674. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8.00 AM to 6.00 PM. The Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) of the art unit 1624 is Mukund Shah whose telephone number is (703) 308-4716.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned (703) 308-4556.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.

*V. Balasubramanian*  
Venkataraman Balasubramanian

7/12/2002.